JUL 0 5 2006

=== COVER PAGE ===

TO: \_\_\_\_\_

FROM:

TONY LAMBERT

FAX: 4036090434

TEL: 4036090434

COMMENT:

PAGE 1/5 \* RCVD AT 7/5/2006 1:18:56 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] \* SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/34 \* DNIS:2738300 \* CSID:4036090434 \* DURATION (mm-ss):03-08

Typed or printed name

## JUL 0 5 2006

PTO/SB/21 (09-04) Approved for use through 07/31/2008, OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Petent and Trademark Office, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Panerwork Reduction Act of 1995, no nersons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number Application Number 09/826 355 TRANSMITTAL Filing Date April 5, 2001 First Named Inventor FORM Dekang Lin Art Unit 2626 Examiner Name Shortledge 7. (to be used for all correspondence after initial filling) Attorney Docket Number 328-2US Total Number of Pages in This Submission **ENCLOSURES** (Check all that apply) After Allowance Communication to TC Drawing(s) Fee Transmittal Form Appeal Communication to Board Licensing-related Papers Fee Attached of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC ~ Petition (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) Amendment/Reply Petition to Convert to a Proprietary Information After Final Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Status Letter Change of Correspondence Address Affidavits/declaration(s) Other Enclosure(s) (please Identify Terminal Disclaimer Extension of Time Request Request for Refund Express Abandonment Request CD. Number of CD(s)\_ Information Disclosure Statement Landscape Table on CD Certified Copy of Priority Remarks Document(s) A response to official action and marked up attachment is attached. Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT Firm Name CUSTOMER NUMBER 020212 Signature Printed name ANTHONY R. LAMBERT Reg. No. Date 2006 32,813 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mall in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below: Signature 12006 Date ANTHONY R. LAMBERT, REG. NO. 32,813, CUST. NO. 020212

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief information Officer, U.S. Patentian Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND PEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

# RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

## JUL 0 5 2006

## PATENT

### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents Alexandria, Virginia U.S.A.

Re:

Application Serial No. 09/826,355

Applicant: Dekang Lin and Patrick Pantel.

Title: Discovery of Inference Rules from Text

Art unit: 2654 2626 Examiner: Shortledge, T. Filed: April 5, 2001

This is in response to the official action dated April 19, 2006.

#### INTERVIEW

The aplicants have requested an interview, but were invited to respond in writing before requesting an interview. If the examiner does not consider the argument presented to explain the difference between the cited reference and the claims, then applicants request a telephone interview with the examiner, which may be arranged by contacting the undersigned at the number indicated at the end of this response.

#### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 -6 and 14-16 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Richardsonn et al. Claims 7 and 9-13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al as applied to claim 1 and further in view of the applicants' prior art. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson et al as applied to claim 1 and further in view of the applicants' prior art and further in view of Zadrozny et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Richardson et al does not teach: "generating a database of inference rules comprising pairs of